

1a

APPENDIX A
FILED
2020 AUG 10 09:00 AM
KING COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT CLERK
E-FILED
CASE #: 20-2-03857-1 SEA

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE
OF WASHINGTON
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING**

HAERIM WON
Plaintiff,
vs
MANDEEP SINGH
Appellant.

NO. 20-2-03857-1 SEA

**ORDER DENYING
APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
OVERLENGTH BRIEF; MOTION
FOR OVERLENGTH REPLY
BRIEF AND MOTION FOR INPERSON
FINAL HEARING**

THIS MATTER having come before the Court on
Appellant's Motion for Overlength Brief; Motion for
Overlength Reply Brief and Motion for In-Person

2a

Final Hearing. The Court has reviewed the pleadings submitted by the parties in support and in opposition of this motion.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Appellant's Motion for Overlength Brief; Motion for Overlength Reply Brief and Motion for In-Person Final Hearing are hereby denied.

DONE ON this 9th day of August, 2020.

Judge Susan Amini

King County Superior Court
Judicial Electronic Signature Page

Case Number: 20-2-03857-1
Case Title: WON v SINGH (APPELLANT/KCD)
Document Title: ORDER

Signed by: Susan Amini
Date: 8/10/2020 9:00:00 AM

/s/Susan Amini
Judge/Commissioner: Susan Amini

3a

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE
OF WASHINGTON
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING**

HAERIM WON

Plaintiff,

vs

MANDEEP SINGH

Appellant.

NO. 20-2-03857-1 SEA

**ORDER DENYING APPELLANT'S MOTION
FOR LOSS OR DAMAGE OF ELECTRONIC
RECORD; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND
MOTION TO STAY THE ENFORCEMENT**

THIS MATTER having come before the Court on Appellant's Motion for Loss or Damage of Electronic Record; Motion for Sanctions and Motion to Stay the enforcement. The Court has reviewed Appellant's Motions. The Appellant has failed to provide a basis for his motions.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Appellant's Motion for Loss or Damage of Electronic Record; Motion for Sanctions and Motion to Stay the enforcement are hereby denied.

DONE ON this 25th day of August, 2020.

4a

Judge Susan Amini

King County Superior Court
Judicial Electronic Signature Page

Case Number: 20-2-03857-1

Case Title: WON v SINGH (APPELLANT/KCD)

Document Title: ORDER

Signed by: Susan Amini

Date: 8/26/2020 9:00:00 AM

/s/Susan Amini

Judge/Commissioner: Susan Amini

5a

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE
OF WASHINGTON
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING**

HAERIM WON
Petitioner-Appellee,
vs
MANDEEP SINGH
Respondent-Appellant.

NO. 20-2-03857-1 SEA

**ORDER DENYING APPELLANT'S RALJ
APPEAL
[CLERK'S ACTION REQUIRED]**

THIS MATTER came before this Court for oral argument on August 21, 2020 pursuant to Appellant, Mandeep Singh' RALJ Appeal. Mr. Singh and Ms. Won appeared pro-se. The Court considered the records and files herein, the oral argument of the parties and the following:

1. Appellant's Opening Brief,
2. Respondent's Responsive Brief,
3. Appellant's Reply Brief, and
4. Clerk's Papers, Transcript and Exhibits from lower court.

When the superior court sits as an appellate court in reviewing a court of limited jurisdiction's ruling, it may not examine the evidence de novo, but shall

accept those factual determinations supported by substantial evidence in the record which were expressly made by the court of limited jurisdiction or that may reasonably be inferred from the judgment of the district court. The superior court shall review the decision of the court of limited jurisdiction to determine whether that court has committed any errors of law¹. The review for errors of law is de novo.² Unchallenged *findings* are verities on appeal.³

1. The Court finds that the Appellant failed to carry the burden of showing that the trial court's Findings of Fact are not supported by substantial evidence.
2. The Court finds that the Appellant failed to carry the burden of showing that the trial court committed any errors of law.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that;

The trial court's Order of Protection – Harassment is AFFIRMED.

Appellant's RALJ appeal is DENIED.

DATED this 25th day of August, 2020.

Susan Amini
King County Superior Court Judge

1 RALJ 9.1; State v. Basson 105 Wash.2d 314 (1986); City of Seattle v. May 151 Wn.App.694 (2009).

2 Id.

3 Id.

7a

King County Superior Court
Judicial Electronic Signature Page

Case Number: 20-2-03857-1
Case Title: WON v SINGH (APPELLANT/KCD)
Document Title: ORDER

Signed by: Susan Amini
Date: 8/26/2020 9:00:00 AM

/s/Susan Amini
Judge/Commissioner: Susan Amini

8a

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE
OF WASHINGTON
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING**

HAERIM WON
Petitioner-Appellee,
vs
MANDEEP SINGH
Respondent-Appellant.

CASE NO. 20-2-03857-1 SEA

**ORDER DENYING APPELLANT'S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

This matter came before the undersigned Court on Appellant Singh's Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Order on RALJ.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Appellant's Motion for Reconsideration is hereby denied.

Done on this 9th day of September, 2020.

Judge Susan H. Amini

9a

King County Superior Court
Judicial Electronic Signature Page

Case Number: 20-2-03857-1
Case Title: WON v SINGH (APPELLANT/KCD)
Document Title: ORDER

Signed by: Susan Amini
Date: 9/10/2020 9:00:00 AM

/s/Susan Amini
Judge/Commissioner: Susan Amini

APPENDIX B

This is not full representation/recreation of the order from KCDC but relevant information from the order has been recreated in this appendix as required by Rule 14.1(g)(i) & Rule 33.1

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT WEST
DIVISION, Seattle Courthouse**

JAN 03 2020

WON, HAERIM, Petitioner,

vs.

SINGH, MANDEEP, Respondent

No. 205-00179

**Temporary Protection Order and Notice of Hearing -
Harassment (TMORAH)**

(Clerk's action required)

**Next Hearing Date and Time: 1/17/2020 @ 1:30 p.m.
E -326 LAP.**

At: SEATTLE Courthouse

516 3rd Ave, room E327

Seattle, WA 98104

Warning to the Respondent: Violation of the provisions of this order with actual notice of its terms is a criminal offense under 10.14 RCW and will subject a violator to arrest. Willful disobedience of the terms of this order may also be contempt of court and subject you to penalties under 7.21 RCW.

3. Minors addressed in this order:

Name	Age	Race	Sec

Based upon the petition, testimony, and case record, the court finds that the respondent committed unlawful harassment as defined in RCW 10.14.080, and that great or irreparable injury to the protected person/s will result if this order is not granted. It is therefore ordered that:

☒ **No-Contact:** Respondent is restrained from making any attempts to contact Petitioner and any minors named in table above.

☒ **Surveillance:** Respondent is **restrained** from making any attempts to keep under surveillance Petitioner and any minors named in table above.

☒ **Stay Away:** Respondent is restrained from entering or being within 1000ft (distance) of Petitioner's ☒ residence ☒ place of employment ☒ other:

Microsoft main campus Redmond

☐ the address is confidential ☐ Petitioner waives confidentiality of the address which::

☒ Other: Exhibits have been filed in the court.

**Washington Crime Information Center
(WACIC) Data Entry**

It is further ordered that the clerk of the court shall forward a copy of this order, and any order to surrender weapons, on or before the next judicial day to SEATTLE ☐ County Sheriff's Office

☒ Police Department, where Petitioner lives and shall enter it into WACIC.

Service

☐ The clerk of the court shall also electronically forward a copy of this order, and any order to surrender weapons, on or before the next judicial day to:

HILLSBORO, OR ☐ County Sheriff's Office.

☐ Police Department, **where Respondent lives** which shall promptly complete and return to this court proof of service. Petitioner shall arrange for service

The respondent is directed to appear and show cause why the court should not enter an order for protection effective for one year or more and order the relief requested by the petitioner or other relief the court deems proper, which may include payment of costs.

Failure to appear at the hearing or to otherwise respond will result in the court issuing an order for protection pursuant to RCW 10.14 effective for a minimum of one year from the date of the hearing. The next hearing date and time is shown below the caption on page one.

A copy of this Temporary Protection Order and Notice of Hearing -Harassment has been filed with the clerk of the court.

This Temporary Order for Protection is effective until the next hearing date and time shown below the caption on page one.

Dated at 1/3/2020 at 2:45 pm /s/**Anne Harper**

Judge ANNE HARPER

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this Order:

Signature of Respondent/Lawyer WSBA No.

14a

Print Name & Date

/s/Haerim Won

Signature of Petitioner/Lawyer WSBA No.

Won, Haerim 1/3/2020

Print Name & Date

Petitioner or Petitioner's Lawyer must complete a
Law Enforcement Information Sheet (LEIS).

15a

This is not full representation/recreation of the order from KCDC but relevant information from the order has been recreated in this appendix as required by Rule 14.1(g)(i) & Rule 33.1

STATE OF WASHINGTON
KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT WEST
DIVISION, Seattle Courthouse

JAN 17 2020

WON, HAERIM, Petitioner,

vs.

SINGH, MANDEEP, Respondent

No. 205-00179

Order for Protection Harassment (ORAH)

Court Address: 516 3rd Ave, room E327

Seattle, WA 98104 Telephone Number: (206)205-
9200 (Clerk's action required)

Warning to the Respondent: Violation of the provisions of this order with actual notice of its terms is a criminal offense under RCW 10.14 and will subject a violator to arrest. Willful disobedience of the terms of this order may also be contempt of court and subject you to penalties under RCW 7.21.

1. Full Faith and Credit: The court has jurisdiction over the parties, the minors and the subject matter. This order is issued in accordance with the Full Faith and Credit provisions of VAWA.18 U.S.C. § 2265.

2. Notice of this hearing was served on the respondent by ☒ personal service [] service by publication pursuant to court order [] other

3. Minors addressed in this order:

Name	Age	Race	Sec

Based upon the petition, testimony, and case record, the court finds that the respondent committed unlawful harassment, as defined in RCW 10.14.080, and was not acting pursuant to any statutory authority, and it is therefore ordered that:

☒ **No-Contact:** Respondent is restrained from making any attempts to contact Petitioner and any minors named in table above.

Includes No 3rd Party or electronic contact

☒ **Surveillance:** Respondent is restrained from making any attempts to keep under surveillance Petitioner and any minors named in table above.

☒ **Stay Away:** Respondent is restrained from entering or being within 500ft (distance) of Petitioner's ☒ residence ☒ place of employment ☐ other:

☐ the address is confidential ☐ Petitioner waives confidentiality of the address which::

**Washington Crime Information Center
(WACIC) Data Entry**

It is further ordered that the clerk of the court shall forward a copy of this order, and any order to surrender weapons, on or before the next judicial day to SEATTLE ☐ County Sheriff's Office

☒ Police Department, where Petitioner lives and shall enter it into WACIC.

Service

☐ The clerk of the court shall also electronically forward a copy of this order, and any order to surrender weapons, on or before the next judicial day to:

HILLSBORO, OR ☐ County Sheriff's Office.

☐ Police Department, **where Respondent** lives which shall promptly complete and return to this court proof of service.

☒ Respondent appeared and was informed of the order by the court, further service is not required.

This Anti-harassment protection order expires on

If the duration of this order exceeds one year, the court finds that Respondent is likely to resume unlawful harassment of the petitioner when the order expires.

Other: _____

Dated at 1/17/2020 3:26 pm /s/Gregg H. Hirakawa

Judge/ Pro Tem

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this Order:

Signature of Respondent/Lawyer WSBA No.

Print Name & Date

/s/Haerim Won

Signature of Petitioner/Lawyer WSBA No.

Won, Haerim 1/17/2020

Print Name & Date

Petitioner or Petitioner's Lawyer must complete a Law Enforcement Information Sheet (LEIS).

Petitioner: The law allows you to register for certain notifications regarding this protection order and its status. Visit www.RegisterVPO.com or call 1-877-242-4055 for more information, or to sign up. If you feel that you are in danger, call 9-1-1 immediately.

20a

This is not full representation/recreation of the order from KCDC but relevant information from the order has been recreated in this appendix as required by Rule 14.1(g)(i) & Rule 33.1

STATE OF WASHINGTON
KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT WEST
DIVISION, Seattle Courthouse

DEC 30 2020

WON, HAERIM, Petitioner,

vs.

SINGH, MANDEEP, Respondent

No. 205-00179-CVKCD

ORDER ON RENEWAL OF ORDER FOR
PROTECTION - Harassment (ORPRTR)

(Clerk's action required)

Notice of this hearing was served on the respondent by ☒ personal service ☐ service by publication pursuant to court order ☐ other: _____

The petition for renewal dated 11/23/2020 is :

☒ Granted: The terms of the Order for Protection entered on 01/17/2020 [date] are renewed and shall

21a

expire on 12/30/21 [date]. If the duration of this order exceeds one year, the court finds that an order of less than one year will be insufficient to prevent further acts of unlawful harassment.

The clerk of the court shall forward a copy of this order on or before the next judicial day to the:

☒ Seattle where petitioner lives which shall enter this order in any computer-based criminal intelligence system available in this state used by law enforcement to list outstanding warrants.

The ☐ clerk of the court ☐ petitioner shall forward a copy of this order on or before the next judicial day to: ☐ converted case where respondent lives which shall personally serve the respondent with a copy of this order and shall promptly complete and return to this court proof of service.

☒ Respondent appeared and was informed of the order by the court; further service is not required.

DATED: Dec 30, 2020 at 1:54 p.m.

/s/L. Stephen Rochon

Jude Pro Tem

This is not full representation/recreation of the order from KCDC but relevant information from the order has been recreated in this appendix as required by Rule 14.1(g)(i) & Rule 33.1

KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
WEST DIVISION, Seattle Courthouse

JAN 15 2021

WON, HAERIM, Petitioner,

vs.

SINGH, MANDEEP, Respondent

No. 205-00179-CVKCD

ORDER ON MOTION

The above-entitled Court, having heard a motion by Defendant/Respondent

Ex Parte Motion for reconsideration

23a

Having considered the motion, pleadings, record in this case, and any arguments of the parties, the Court finds:

Reserved

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

Respondent may raise motion if both parties appear at 1/20/21 hearing in 20CIV14926KCX.

Dated: Jan 15, 2021

/s/Gregg Hirakawa

Judge Gregg Hirakawa

24a

This is not full representation/recreation of the order from KCDC but relevant information from the order has been recreated in this appendix as required by Rule 14.1(g)(i) & Rule 33.1

KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT

STATE OF WASHINGTON

WEST DIVISION, Seattle Courthouse

JAN 20 2021

Mandeep Singh, Petitioner,

vs.

Haerim Won, Respondent

No. 20CIV14926KCX

ORDER Re Petition/Motion Harassment

Hearing Date/Time: Jan 20th, 2021 At 1:15 PM

At:

Shoreline Courtroom I

18050 Meridian Avenue North

Shoreline , WA 98133

This Matter is before the court upon the request of (name) Mandeep Singh, for a:

☒ Full Order

and the court finding:

☒ The reason for denial of the order are:

The Petitioner is seeking an Anti-Harassment Protection Order under circumstances wherein the Respondent is the Protected Party in the King County District Court 205-00179 which matter has been appealed and is pending in the Court of Appeals. The Petitioner Herein is transparently the aggressor and is offended by the Ms. Won's use of language to convince him the leave her alone.

☒: A preponderance of the evidence has not established that there has been harassment.

☒: Other:

As noted the court finds the Petitioner, Singh, to be the aggressor in the Harassment and that the Respondent the Victim. This petitioner has not met his burden of proof. He is trying to perpetrate a fraud upon the court.

The court orders that:

☒ The request for a full order is denied, and the petition is dismissed. Any previously entered temporary order expires at 4:00PM today.

This order is dated and signed in open court.

Date Jan 20, 2021 Time 2:31PM

26a

/s/ Judge Stephen G. Smith.

Judge Stephen Smith.

This is not full representation/recreation of the order from KCDC but relevant information from the order has been recreated in this appendix as required by Rule 14.1(g)(i) & Rule 33.1

**KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
WEST DIVISION, Seattle Courthouse**

JAN 26 2021

Mandeep Singh, Petitioner,

vs.

Haerim Won, Respondent

No. 20CIV14926KCX

ORDER ON MOTION

The above-entitled Court, having heard a motion by Plaintiff/Petitioner

Reconsideration

Having considered the motion, pleadings, record in this case, and any arguments of the parties, the Court finds:

The Court has reviewed the pleadings and records on file, and has considered the request of Petitioner to reopen or reconsider the Court's January 20, 2021 Denial Order. The Court finds that there are no grounds for reconsideration.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration is denied.

Dated: Jan 26, 2021

/s/Judge Joe Campagna

Judge Joe Campagna

29a

This is not full representation/recreation of the order from KCDC but relevant information from the order has been recreated in this appendix as required by Rule 14.1(g)(i) & Rule 33.1

STATE OF WASHINGTON
KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT WEST
DIVISION, Seattle Courthouse

Apr 5 2021

WON, HAERIM, Petitioner,

vs.

SINGH, MANDEEP, Respondent

No. 205-00179-CVKCD

ORDER ON RENEWAL OF ORDER FOR
PROTECTION - Harassment (ORPRTR)

Amended

/s/Judge Joe Campagna

4/19/2021

(Clerk's action required)

Notice of this hearing was served on the respondent by ☒ personal service ☐ service by publication pursuant to court order ☒ other: agreed motions requesting a permanent order.

The petition for renewal dated 1/27/2021 is :

[X] Granted: The terms of the Order for Protection entered on 01/17/2020 [date] are renewed and shall expire on 4/5/2031 [date]. If the duration of this order exceeds one year, the court finds that ~~an order of less than one year will be insufficient to prevent further acts of unlawful harassment.~~ ***The parties agreed to an order with extended duration.***

The clerk of the court shall forward a copy of this order on or before the next judicial day to the:

[X] Seattle PD where petitioner lives which shall enter this order in any computer-based criminal intelligence system available in this state used by law enforcement to list outstanding warrants.

The [] clerk of the court [] petitioner shall forward a copy of this order on or before the next judicial day to: [] Seattle PD where respondent lives which shall personally serve the respondent with a copy of this order and shall promptly complete and return to this court proof of service.

[X] Respondent appeared, and was informed of the order by the court; further service is not required.

DATED: April 5, 2021 at 5:13 p.m.

/s/Judge Joe Campagna

31a

Jude Joe Campagna

APPENDIX C

THE COURT OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

RICHARD D. JOHNSON, Court Administrator/Clerk	DIVISION I One Union Square 600 University Street Seattle, WA 98101-4170 (206) 464-7750 TDD: (206) 587-5505
--	--

February 9, 2021

Mandeep Singh	Haerim Won
---------------	------------

Mandeep Singh
Petitioner,
v.
Haerim Won,
Respondent

CASE #. 81813-9-I

Counsel:

The following notation ruling by Commissioner Jennifer Koh of the Court was entered on February 9, 2021:

"Mandeep Singh seeks discretionary review of an August 26, 2020 superior court order on RALJ appeal affirming the district court's January 17, 2020 Order for Protection – Harassment, restraining

Singh from contacting Haerim Won. For the reasons stated below, discretionary review is denied.

After a hearing on January 17, 2020, the King County District Court entered a protection order prohibiting Singh from contacting ("including no 3rd party or electronic contact") or surveilling Won or being within 500 feet of her home or workplace.

On August 26, 2020, the superior court entered an order affirming the district court's protection order based on its determination that Singh failed to establish that the district court's findings of fact were not supported by substantial evidence or that the district court committed any errors of law. On September 10, 2020, the superior court entered an order denying Singh's motion for reconsideration.

In this context, discretionary review will be accepted only if Singh meets the standard of RAP 2.3(d). Singh cites RAP 2.3(d)(2) and RAP 2.3(d)(4). Under RAP 2.3(d)(2), Singh contends that the case involves significant constitutional questions regarding his confrontation rights and his right against self-incrimination. In particular, he contends that he was "not aware" of the evidence presented against him at the district court hearing because Won presented it "manipulatively and shuffled"; and that he was "not aware" of "unknowingly waiving" his right against self-incrimination. Singh acknowledges that the district court proceedings were not criminal in nature, but claims also that it "is a criminal case because an entry has been made in the Washington and National Crime database."

But, anti-harassment proceedings are civil in nature and involve the trial court's exercise of equity jurisdiction. See *State v. Noah*, 103 Wn. App. 29, 37-38, 9 P.3d 858 (2000). And, the materials submitted to this Court suggest that Singh and Won were present at the district court hearing and the district court required the parties to disclose any evidence before submitting it to the court. The fact that the trial court asked to hear the evidence in an order that differs from the way Singh would have chosen to submit it does not appear to implicate any constitutional right. Singh does not cite any relevant authority to suggest that this matter involves significant questions of constitutional law.

Citing RAP 2.3(d)(4), Singh also contends that the superior court departed from the usual course of judicial proceedings by denying his procedural motions, accepting a late-filed brief from Won, and ignoring arguments he raised and additional evidence he wished to present.

He complains that RALJ procedures do not include a rule similar to RAP 9.11. He suggests the district court departed from the usual course of judicial proceedings by asking Won to start her recitation of events from the most recent event and work back.

Based on a review of the materials presented, I am not persuaded that the superior court departed from the usual course of judicial proceedings or sanctioned such a departure by the district court. On the contrary, the district court held a hearing at which it gave each party an opportunity to submit testimony and evidence and then stated its findings on the

record and entered an order. The superior court considered and addressed the parties procedural motions, reviewed the briefing, held a hearing at which each party was allowed to present argument, and entered a written order. Singh fails to identify any authority requiring courts to exhaustively and explicitly address on the record every non-dispositive item of evidence or argument raised by a party regardless of the lack of persuasive value or weight.

Singh fails to show circumstances justifying discretionary review under RAP 2.3(d). Accordingly, the motion for discretionary review is denied."

Sincerely,

/s/Richard D. Johnson

Richard D. Johnson
Court Administrator/Clerk
c: Honorable Susan Amini
SSD

CASE #. 81813-9-I

"After the December 11, 2020 hearing scheduled in this discretionary review matter, Petitioner Mandeep Singh filed (1) a motion to vacate a judgment entered by the district court on January

17, 2020; (2) a motion to stay trial court proceedings regarding a petition for renewal of a protection order filed on November 23, 2020; (3) sealed personal health care records; and (4) a motion to consolidate proceedings pending in the district court and transfer them to this Court. Singh has cited various court rules and provided argument to support his requests. Regardless of his interpretation of court rules or his view of the requirements of equity, none of these filings are properly before this Court. The inquiry before this Court in this matter was limited to whether to grant review of a superior court decision on review of the district court's protection order. RAP 2.3(d) provides the standard for this Court's decision regarding review. My previous ruling entered today explains my ruling under RAP 2.3(d). Because Singh's other motions are not properly considered in this matter, they are denied and will be placed in the file without further action."

Sincerely,

/s/Richard D. Johnson

Richard D. Johnson
Court Administrator/Clerk
c: Honorable Susan Amini
SSD

THE COURT OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

CASE #. 81813-9-I

Please find enclosed a copy of the Order Denying Motion to Modify the Commissioner's ruling and Motion to Publish entered in the above case today. The order will become final unless counsel files a motion for discretionary review within thirty days from the date of this order. RAP 13.5(a).
Sincerely,

39a

/s/ Lea Ennis
Court Administrator/Clerk

enclosure
SSD

40a

FILED
5/5/2021
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington

**THE COURT OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION I**

Haerim Won,
Respondent,
v.
Mandeep Singh
Petitioner

CASE #. 81813-9-I

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO MODIFY AND
MOTION TO PUBLISH**

Petitioner Mandeep Singh moves to modify Commissioner Jennifer Koh's February 9, 2021 ruling denying discretionary review of a superior court order on RALJ appeal affirming the district court's January 17, 2020 order of protection restraining Singh from contacting Haerim Won.

41a

Singh also moves to publish the ruling under RAP 12.3(e). Respondent, Won, has filed a response. We have considered the motion to modify under RAP 17.7 and the motion to publish under RAP 12.3(e) and determined that both motions should be denied. Now, therefore, it is hereby
ORDERED that the motion to modify is denied, it is further
ORDERED that the motion to publish is denied.

For the court:

/s/The Honorable Three Judge Panel Signature

42a

APPENDIX D

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
7/16/2021
BY ERIN L. LENNON
CLERK

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF
WASHINGTON**

Haerim Won,
Respondent,
v.
Mandeep Singh
Petitioner

No. 99840-0
Court of Appeals No. 81813-9-I
RULING DENYING REVIEW

Pro se petitioner Mandeep Singh seeks discretionary review of a decision by Division One of the Court of Appeals of a King County Superior Court order on RALJ appeal affirming a district court antiharassment protection order prohibiting petitioner from contacting respondent Haerim Won.

The motion for discretionary review is denied for reasons explained below.

Petitioner and respondent are computer industry professionals. They met at a work-related social event. . Petitioner persuaded respondent to provide him with her personal telephone number for purposes of professional networking. Petitioner subsequently began contacting respondent in an obsessive pattern that resembled stalking. Petitioner also contacted one of respondent's colleagues and began asking for contact information concerning respondent and her family. Respondent tried to rebuff petitioner's advances but petitioner persisted, even after being contacted by law enforcement. One of the law enforcement contacts was the result of petitioner trying to visit respondent at her apartment. Petitioner contacted other colleagues of respondent, potentially affecting her employment. The evidence indicates the situation caused respondent a great deal of distress.

In January 2020 the district court entered an order prohibiting petitioner from contacting respondent, including indirect contact via third parties or contact by electronic means, or surveilling respondent or being within 500 feet of respondent's home or workplace. Petitioner appealed the protection order to the superior court, which affirmed the order in August 2020 and denied reconsideration.

Petitioner sought discretionary review in the Court of Appeals, arguing the superior court's RALJ decision involved a significant constitutional question and that the superior court had departed unacceptably from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings. RAP 2.3(d)(2), (4). Commissioner Jennifer Koh determined petitioner's arguments in support of review were unpersuasive and denied discretionary review. A panel of judges denied petitioner's motions to modify the commissioner's ruling and to publish it. RAP 17.7.¹

Petitioner now seeks this court's discretionary review and has also filed a motion seeking supplementation of the record with a video recording, suppression of all evidence used in the district court, consolidation of the district court and superior court cases, and dismissal of the district court case. Respondent filed an answer opposing review and an answer opposing the motion to supplement the record.²

1 After oral argument in the Court of Appeals, petitioner moved to vacate a recent district court judgment; to stay court proceedings in relation to a petition to renew a November 2020 protection order, and to consolidate district court cases and transfer them to the Court of Appeals. Petitioner also filed sealed personal medical records. In a later ruling, the commissioner denied petitioner's post-argument motions as not properly before the court. It does not appear that petitioner moved to modify that ruling, and petitioner does not challenge it here.

2 Meanwhile, the district court extended the protection order to 2031. That decision is not before me.

The parties argued their respective positions at a video conference hearing conducted on July 15, 2021.³

Petitioner contends that the Court of Appeals committed obvious error that renders further proceedings useless; that the court committed probable error that substantially alters the status quo or that substantially limits petitioner's freedom to act; and that the Court of Appeals departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by the lower courts, to such a degree this court must exercise its revisory jurisdiction. RAP 13.5(b).⁴ These arguments are unpersuasive.

Petitioner mainly disputes the district court's consideration and weighing of evidence and the court's factual findings in support of the protection order. Petitioner is also displeased that he is now identified in law enforcement databases. The available records indicate issuance of the order was plainly justified to protect respondent from petitioner's disturbing and unrelenting pattern of harassing behavior. RCW 10.14.010-.030. Entry of

³ The hearing was livestreamed and recorded on TVW. www.tvw.org.

⁴ Petitioner erroneously asserts review is justified also because this case involves an issue of substantial public interest. RAP 13.4(b)(4). That criterion does not apply here.

such an order results in it being entered in law enforcement information databases. RCW 10.14.110.

The record on review also demonstrates that the superior court did not err in affirming the district court on RALJ appeal. Petitioner failed to show that the order was not supported by substantial evidence or that the district court committed errors of law. RALJ 9.1. Contrary to petitioner's arguments, the verbatim record indicates that both the district court and the superior court treated petitioner fairly. Furthermore, petitioner fails to show any violation of his constitutional rights. The Court of Appeals did not err, either obviously or probably, in determining this fact-centered civil matter did not merit review under either RAP 2.3(d)(2) or 2.3(d)(4). Nothing in the Court of Appeals decision reflects a departure from the usual and accepted course of judicial proceedings. In sum, petitioner fails to identify any grounds justifying this court's review under RAP 13.5(b).⁵

The motion for discretionary review is denied.

/s/ Michael E. Johnston
COMMISSIONER

July 16, 2021

⁵ Petitioner's motion to supplement the record, was denied orally at the start of the teleconference hearing and that oral ruling is denied again in this ruling. The motion amounted to an improper attempt to inject new evidence in this court. The requests to consolidate and dismiss are denied as well.

47a

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
9/1/2021
BY ERIN L. LENNON
CLERK

THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

Haerim Won,
Respondent,
v.
Mandeep Singh
Petitioner

No. 99840-0

ORDER

Court of Appeals No. 81813-9-I

Department II of the Court, composed of Chief Justice González and Justices Madsen, Stephens, Yu and Whitener (Justice Johnson sat for Justice Madsen), considered this matter at its August 31, 2021, Motion Calendar and unanimously agreed that the following order be entered.

48a

IT IS ORDERED

That the Petitioner's motion to modify the
Commissioner's ruling is denied.

DATED at Olympia, Washington, this 1st day of
September, 2021.

For the Court

/s/Chief Justice Gonzalez
CHIEF JUSTICE

APPENDIX E

FEDERAL RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION¹

Definition

The power of a court to adjudicate a particular type of matter and provide the remedy demanded.

Overview:

A court must have jurisdiction to enter a valid, enforceable judgment on a claim. Where jurisdiction is lacking, litigants, through various procedural mechanisms, may retroactively challenge the validity of a judgment.

Jurisdiction may be broken down into two categories: personal jurisdiction and subject matter jurisdiction. Personal jurisdiction is the requirement that a given court have power over the defendant, based on minimum contacts with the forum. Subject-matter jurisdiction is the requirement that a given court have power to hear the specific kind of claim that is brought to that court. While litigating parties may waive personal jurisdiction, they cannot waive subject-matter jurisdiction. **In federal court, under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a**

¹ From

https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/subject_matter_jurisdiction

motion to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction is considered a favored defense and may be raised at any point in the litigation process, even if the parties had previously argued that subject-matter jurisdiction existed. In fact, the court may dismiss a case sua sponte (on its own) for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(1).

Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)

(b) How to Present Defenses. Every defense to a claim for relief in any pleading must be asserted in the responsive pleading if one is required. But a party may assert the following defenses by motion:

- (1) lack of subject-matter jurisdiction;
- (2) lack of personal jurisdiction;
- (3) improper venue;
- (4) insufficient process;
- (5) insufficient service of process;
- (6) failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; and
- (7) failure to join a party under Rule 19.

Personal Jurisdiction¹

Personal jurisdiction refers to the power that a court has to make a decision regarding the party being sued in a case. Before a court can exercise power over a party, the U.S. Constitution requires that the party has certain minimum contacts with the forum in which the court sits. *International Shoe v. Washington*, 326 US 310 (1945). So if the plaintiff sues a defendant, that defendant can object to the suit by arguing that the court does not have personal jurisdiction over the defendant.

Waiving Personal Jurisdiction

Personal jurisdiction can generally be waived (contrast this with Subject Matter Jurisdiction, which cannot be waived), so if the party being sued appears in a court without objecting to the court's lack of personal jurisdiction over it, then the court will assume that the defendant is waiving any challenge to personal jurisdiction. See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2).

Obtaining Personal Jurisdiction

Typically for a court to have personal jurisdiction over a defendant, the plaintiff needs to serve the defendant in the state in which the court sits, and the defendant needs to voluntarily appear in court.

¹ From https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/personal_jurisdiction

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 4(k) describes whether a state's courts would have the authority to adjudicate a claim as it relates to personal jurisdiction.

Fed Rules Civ Proc Rule 4(k):

Territorial Limits of Effective Service.

(1) In General. Serving a summons or filing a waiver of service establishes personal jurisdiction over a defendant:

(A) who is subject to the jurisdiction of a court of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located;

(B) who is a party joined under Rule 14 or 19 and is served within a judicial district of the United States and not more than 100 miles from where the summons was issued; or

(C) when authorized by a federal statute.

APPENDIX F
RELEVANT STATUTES FROM REVISED
CODE OF WASHINGTON (RCW), CIVIL RULES
& RALJ2.2(d)

RCW 10.14.010

Legislative finding, intent.

The legislature finds that serious, personal harassment through repeated invasions of a person's privacy by acts and words showing a pattern of harassment designed to **coerce, intimidate, or humiliate** the victim is increasing.

RCW 10.14.020

Definitions.

Unless the context clearly requires otherwise, the definitions in this section apply throughout this chapter.

(1) "Course of conduct" means a pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time, however short, evidencing a continuity of purpose. "Course of conduct" includes, in addition to any other form of communication, contact, or conduct, the sending of an electronic communication, but does not include constitutionally protected free speech. Constitutionally protected activity is not included within the meaning of "course of conduct."

(2) "Unlawful harassment" means a knowing and willful course of conduct directed at a specific person which seriously alarms, annoys, harasses, or is detrimental to such person, and which serves no legitimate or lawful purpose. The course of conduct

shall be such as would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress, and shall actually cause substantial emotional distress to the petitioner, or, when the course of conduct would cause a reasonable parent to fear for the wellbeing of their child.

RCW 10.14.030

Course of conduct—Determination of purpose.

In determining whether the course of conduct serves any legitimate or lawful purpose, the court should consider whether:

- (1) Any current contact between the parties was initiated by the respondent only or was initiated by both parties;
- (2) The respondent has been given clear notice that all further contact with the petitioner is unwanted;
- (3) The respondent's course of conduct appears designed to alarm, annoy, or harass the petitioner;
- (4) The respondent is acting pursuant to any statutory authority, including but not limited to acts which are reasonably necessary to:
 - (a) Protect property or liberty interests;
 - (b) Enforce the law; or
 - (c) Meet specific statutory duties or requirements;
- (5) The respondent's course of conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with the petitioner's privacy or the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive living environment for the petitioner;

(6) Contact by the respondent with the petitioner or the petitioner's family has been limited in any manner by any previous court order.

RCW 10.14.150

Jurisdiction.

(1) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction and cognizance of any civil actions and proceedings brought under this chapter, except the district court shall transfer such actions and proceedings to the superior court when it is shown that (a) the respondent to the petition is under eighteen years of age; (b) the action involves title or possession of **real** property; (c) a superior court has exercised or is exercising jurisdiction over a proceeding involving the parties; or (d) the action would have the effect of interfering with a respondent's care, control, or custody of the respondent's minor child.

(2) Municipal courts may exercise jurisdiction and cognizance of any civil actions and proceedings brought under this chapter by adoption of local court rule, except the municipal court shall transfer such actions and proceedings to the superior court when it is shown that (a) the respondent to the petition is under eighteen years of age; (b) the action involves title or possession of real property; (c) a superior court has exercised or is exercising jurisdiction over a proceeding involving the parties; or (d) the action would have the effect of interfering with a respondent's care, control, or custody of the respondent's minor child.

(3) The civil jurisdiction of district and municipal courts under this chapter is limited to the issuance and enforcement of temporary orders for protection in cases that require transfer to superior court under subsections (1) and (2) of this section. The district or municipal court shall transfer the case to superior court after the temporary order is entered.

(4) Superior courts shall have concurrent jurisdiction to receive transfer of antiharassment petitions in cases where a district or municipal court judge makes findings of fact and conclusions of law showing that meritorious reasons exist for the transfer.

(5) The municipal and district courts shall have jurisdiction and cognizance of any criminal actions brought under RCW 10.14.120 and 10.14.170.

RCW 10.14.155

Personal jurisdiction—Nonresident individual.

(Effective until July 1, 2022.)

(1) In a proceeding in which a petition for an order for protection under this chapter is sought, a court of this state may exercise personal jurisdiction over a nonresident individual if:

(a) The individual is personally served with a petition within this state;

RCW 4.36.120**Libel or slander, how pleaded.**

In an action for libel or slander, it shall not be necessary to state in the complaint any extrinsic facts, for the purpose of showing the application to the plaintiff, of the defamatory matter out of which the cause arose, but it shall be sufficient to state generally, that the same was published or spoken concerning the plaintiff; and if such allegation be controverted, the plaintiff shall be bound to establish on trial that it was so published or spoken.

RCW 4.16.080**Actions limited to three years.**

The following actions shall be commenced within three years:

(2) An action for taking, detaining, or injuring personal property, including an action for the specific recovery thereof, or for any other injury to the person or rights of another not hereinafter enumerated;

(3) Except as provided in RCW 4.16.040(2), an action upon a contract or liability, express or implied, which is not in writing, and does not arise out of any written instrument;

CIVIL RULES CR 60(b) RELIEF FROM JUDGEMENT

58a

Mistakes; Inadvertence; Excusable Neglect; Newly Discovered Evidence; Fraud; etc. On motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a party or the party's legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:

(1) Mistakes, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect or irregularity in obtaining a judgment or order;

(2) For erroneous proceedings against a minor or person of unsound mind, when the condition of such defendant does not appear in the record, nor the error in the proceedings;

(3) Newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under rule 59(b);

(4) Fraud (whether heretofore denominated intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party;

(5) The judgment is void;

(6) The judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, or a prior judgment upon which it is based has been reversed or otherwise vacated, or it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application;

(7) If the defendant was served by publication, relief may be granted as prescribed in RCW 4.28.200;

(8) Death of one of the parties before the judgment in the action;

(9) Unavoidable casualty or misfortune preventing the party from prosecuting or defending;

(10) Error in judgment shown by a minor, within 12 months after arriving at full age; or

(11) Any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment.

The motion shall be made within a reasonable time and for reasons (1), (2) or (3) not more than 1 year after the judgment, order, or proceeding was entered or taken. If the party entitled to relief is a minor or a person of unsound mind, the motion shall be made within 1 year after the disability ceases. A motion under this section (b) does not affect the finality of the judgment or suspend its operation.

RALJ 2.2(d)

(d) Errors Raised for First Time on Appeal. The superior court may refuse to review any claim of error that was not raised in the court of limited jurisdiction. However, a party may raise the following claimed errors for the first time on appeal: (1) lack of jurisdiction, (2) failure to establish facts upon which relief can be granted, and (3) manifest error affecting a constitutional right.

**APPENDIX G
PLEADINGS WHERE FEDERAL &
JURISDICTION QUESTION WAS RAISED BY
SINGH**

1. **'Brief of Appellant' filed Apr 6th, 2020, KCSC Appeal case # 20-2-03857-1 SEA.**
Appellant is Singh & Respondent is Won in this pleading by Singh.

1. ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS

1. The appellant (Mandeep) lives in Oregon and is not and never ever been Washington state residence. From RALJ Rule 2.2 (d) (1), given the physical distance and different states involved, the KCDC case (#205-00179) is not a district court case of limited jurisdiction.
2. Given the amount of financial loss (almost \$1 Million) involved on Mandeep's side, the case does not fall under district court of limited jurisdiction.
3. The district court erred by not considering all the evidence from the appellant's side. Appellant even mentioned in the court for the evidence to be consider but it was denied, without looking, by The Honorable Judge. As per RALJ Rule 2.2 (d) (2), this is clearly a failure to establish

facts by the district court. The evidence that were not taken is key which uncovers the exact situation and communications with the respondent. The evidence reveals that each event happened one after the other like daisy chain with legitimate purpose (the legitimate purpose mentioned in the statute HT, P22L2). The respondent (Christy) has deliberately presented excerpts from the communications to paint the appellant negatively. She has also shuffled some of the communications purely to make a case against me.

If The Superior Court considers it inconclusive from the verbatim transcript and from the audio of the limited court hearing that it is not evident The KCDC Judge denied or did not consider the evidence then I would consider this as "loss or damage of electronic record" and as per RALJ 5.4, I should be entitled to a new hearing. I have already submitted a motion (along with this brief) in this regard if The Superior Court perceives it inconclusive.

4. The district court erred by not allowing appellant's wife and daughter (who has been through a lot in this ordeal) to be present in the court room for the entire proceeding. While the respondent (Christy) and respondent's friend (Leeann Choi) were there for the entire time of the hearing even though the cases 205-00178 and 205-00179 are different cases. It

should not be ignored that Christy used profane words on me and my family (wife and daughter).

5. "The petition for order for protection" was served to me in Menlo Park, California on Jan 10th, 2020 at around 9AM. This is borderline close to minimum number of days (5 days) before the papers are served before hearing date on Jan 17th, 2020. Considering working days, it is at minimum number of days before the hearing date. Considering Mandeep is studying in California at Stanford University with tough course deliverable deadlines, 5 days is very less time for a person to prepare and respond to court notices. This is first time Mandeep is involved in any court matter.
6. The respondent (Christy) errored in serving incomplete case documents to the appellant (Mandeep). There is mention of the exhibits in the "Petition for order of protection - Harassment and Stalking" by the respondent, but the appellant did not get any exhibits when served. During the entire hearing appellant is not aware of any exhibits by the respondent or respondent's friend. Appellant is not aware of what exhibits were presented by the respondent. While during the hearing when the appellant wanted The Honorable Judge to take the evidence, The Honorable

Judge asked appellant to cross verify the evidence with the respondent. Only 2 evidence was taken from appellant. There is key evidence which proves that I was at Microsoft building not to meet respondent but to return the certificate to the signatory. This evidence was not taken. There is numerous other evidence which The Honorable Judge from district court did not even considered listening to or accepting during the hearing.

7. The district court erred, without establishing facts RALJ Rule 2.2 (d) (2), by concluding that I may show up at the Christy's(respondent) residence again. The district court ignored the fact that I was only near to Christy's residence once (in June 2019) that too I asked (not demanded) Christy to meet which she did not respond, and I left without meeting. I am not aware of where Christy works other than her company name. I was at Christy's company to return the certificate to the signatory. This certificate was earned where Christy was my coach. I have never seen/met Christy between Dec13, 2018 and Jan 17, 2020 (court hearing date). I have never seen/met respondent's friend (Leeann Choi) but only on court hearing date (Jan 17, 2020).
8. The district court erred by ignoring the fact that respondent(Christy) has

abused/bullied (WAC 132Q-10-215) the appellant putting the appellant into depression(causing suicidal thoughts, causing to sell home and quit his permanent job at Intel) which was the main cause of asking to meet with the respondent to sort things amicably. Respondent used profane words towards the appellant. Respondent knowingly used profane words towards appellant regarding appellant's daughter and wife. Given all this, appellant only wanted to sort things amicably with respondent.

-
2. **'Motion for Reconsideration' filed Aug 22nd, 2020, KCSC Appeal case # 20-2-03857-1 SEA.**
-

A. IDENTITY OF MOVING PARTY:

Mandeep Singh, Appellant, asks The Court to reconsider Judgement on RALJ.

B. STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT:

Mandeep Singh (appellant) respectfully asks to:

1. Vacate the Judgement by The District Court on case number 205-00179 KCDC.
2. To have the case de novo.

C. FACTS RELEVANT TO THIS MOTION:

1. The Superior Court has ignored the 'Assignment of Errors' and 'Statement of Facts' in Brief of Appellant (sub #13). Also, no effort has been made to understand the case facts or even consider The Law (RALJ 2.2(d)(1)(2)(3)) mentioned:

a. There was no reason given why the motion for overlength brief of appellant and motion for overlength reply brief was denied because generally these motions are approved.

b. Decision on Motion for loss or damage of electronic record and Motion for overlength brief of appellant has been pending ever since these motions were filed on 04/06/2020.

2. There is no jurisdiction (RALJ 2.2(d)(1)) for KCDC to even grant protection order against Mr. Singh because Mr. Singh is not Washington State resident. The Washington State Courts have no jurisdiction to exercise any order against Mr. Singh. Being a law-abiding citizen who respects law, I am respecting all the court procedures, orders and rules of Washington State Courts.

3. The Superior Court ignored RALJ 2.2(d)(2). The KCDC failed to establish facts and rushed to grant protection order. The same error is being made by The Superior Court by ignoring this rule.

4. The Superior Court ignored constitutional violation of my 6th amendment where I did not got chance to see the evidence against me during The KCDC hearing. This falls under RALJ 2.2(d)(3).

5. The Superior Court has not looked at the motions that were filed:

a. Motion for loss or damage of electronic record.

- As already explained that when The District Court Judge made gesture of denial to take all evidence from me for the first time, I was blacked out. I also mentioned to take evidence in other parts of the hearing, but The Honorable Judge said it's too late. Why this should not be granted for case de novo? So, The Court wants to blindly believe that all case facts were reviewed? This is failure to establish facts (RALJ 2.2 (d) (2)) and rushing to wrongful judgement.

It is not appellant's responsibility if The District Court cannot make video recording and The District Court's microphones are not working properly. This is clearly loss or damage of electronic record.

b. Motion for sanctions and

c. Motion to stay or vacate the Judgement.

3. **'Motion for Discretionary Review' filed Sept 23rd, 2020, Court of Appeals case # 81813-9-I.**

(c) Jurisdiction – RALJ 2.2(d)(1). Mr. Singh is not Washington State resident and never ever has been Washington State residence. How does The Law expect an innocent person who lives in Menlo Park, California (consider Florida or Hawaii for that matter, let alone the expensive air travel ticket) should know the Judicial System and Court proceedings of Washington state in 5 days? On top of that the petition, dated 1/3/2020, by Ms. Won is manipulative and contains shuffled chain of events. How does The Judicial System of Washington state expect Mr. Singh to act like a robot and make quick decisions and not bring his emotions into the play? Mr. Singh is a human and values humble ways to earn living. **Jurisdictional argument in and of itself makes the King County District Court case to be dismissed.** This is obvious error committed by The Superior Court under RAP 2.3(b)(1) when this argument was brought up in The Superior Court appeal.

4. 'Reply to Answer to Motion for Discretionary Review' filed Oct 8th, 2020, Court of Appeals case # 81813-9-I.

(c) Singh completely understands the Full Faith of VAWA act, but this only comes after the fact of KCDC case proceedings! There is no mention of "Full Faith of VAWA act" jurisdiction in the temporary protection order papers Singh got served with on 1/10/2020! How will Singh know where to call even for lawyer in 5 days? Its days after the 1/17/2020 hearing, Singh came to know that even to hire lawyers is so expensive. Singh don't know about Seattle area where he can walk into the court clerk counter in person and ask how to deal with the manipulative representation of facts by Won. 5 days may be considered legally enough number of days for local residents in the Seattle metro. 5 days is surely not enough for a person who lives in different state and who don't know about the court proceedings and The Justice System of different State (Justice System of any State for that matter). Won is misleading the court when she uses the word "repeated" travel to Won's residence and workplace. Singh only went to Won's residence once, that too when she demanded Singh to get his wife and daughter to Seattle (June 11-12, 2019 text evidence already in

69a

Brief but not on record of KCDC). As far as workplace goes, Singh only went to return the 1st certificate to John Shewchuk, that too when Singh had to take international flight from Seattle. Singh didn't know where Won works other than her company name – Already explained in Briefs. 4-hour drive is NOT driving distance.

APPENDIX H
Excerpts from or Additional notes¹

a. A Closer Look: Fighting Words

The Supreme Court has defined fighting words to mean words that “inflict injury” or cause an “immediate breach of peace.”⁵⁰ When the Court first construed the term, it implied that fighting words were not within the scope of the First Amendment because they were not considered speech at all.⁵¹ More recently, however, the Court has stepped away from this notion and the doctrine has evolved significantly.⁵² The Supreme Court has stressed the

1 From Courtney E. Ruggeri, “You Just Need to Do It!”: When Texts Encouraging Suicide Do Not Warrant Free Speech Protection, 62 B.C. L. Rev. 1017 (2021), <https://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/bclr/vol62/iss3/8>

50 Chaplinsky, 315 U.S. at 572

51 Michael J. Mannheimer, Note, The Fighting Words Doctrine, 93 COLUM. L.REV. 1527, 1527 (1993); see Chaplinsky, 315 U.S. at 571, 573 (articulating that fighting words are not a way to express ideas). In 1942, in Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that “[r]esort to epithets or personal abuse is not in any proper sense communication of information or opinion safeguarded by the Constitution.” Id. at 572 (quoting Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296, 309–10 (1940)).

52 See R.A.V., 505 U.S. at 383 (articulating that even categorically unprotected speech must be viewed in context when assessing the applicability of First Amendment protection).

requirement that the words be directed to an individual in a face-to-face context.⁵³ Furthermore, the Court has been increasingly hesitant to turn to the fighting words doctrine to restrict speech for its content alone, instead focusing on the context.⁵⁴ Although the doctrine has changed since its origination and legal scholars have cast doubt on the true purpose of this exclusion, the Court continues to recognize fighting words among those categories of speech excluded from First Amendment protection.⁵⁵

b. A Closer Look: True Threats

Similar to the fighting words exclusion, the Supreme Court has placed significant limitations on what is considered a true threat, and thus outside the bounds of First Amendment protection.⁵⁶ The Court

⁵³ Mannheimer, *supra* note 51, at 1551.

⁵⁴ *Id.* at 1546–48.

⁵⁵ See STONE ET AL., *supra* note 14, at 84 (recognizing that various decisions cite the fighting words exclusion, including in recent years); Mannheimer, *supra* note 51, at 1548 (reiterating that fighting words is a well-established category of unprotected speech, even amidst changes to the doctrine).

⁵⁶ See Jennifer E. Rothman, Freedom of Speech and True Threats, 25 HARV.J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 283, 295–96 (2001) (analyzing the factors the Supreme Court suggested when determining whether speech rises to the level of a true threat). Because the Court views First Amendment exclusions narrowly, the context, the audience reaction, the dependency of the statement, and the setting in which the words were spoken are all relevant factors in the Court's inquiry. *Id.* at 295, 298.

defines true threats as statements indicating that the speaker intends to commit an act of violence against a person or group.⁵⁷ This restriction does not simply protect individuals from violent acts, but it also protects them from fear of violence and the ensuing disruption this fear is likely to cause.⁵⁸ Similar to fighting words, there has been debate about what true threats actually encompass and how to determine when speech fits into this category.⁵⁹

57 *Virginia v. Black*, 538 U.S. 343, 359 (2003). In 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Virginia v. Black* held that the Commonwealth of Virginia was legally authorized to prohibit individuals from burning crosses as a form of intimidation under the true threats exclusion. *Id.* at 357, 363.

58 *Id.* at 360.

59 *Watts v. United States*, 394 U.S. 705, 708 (1969) (*per curiam*) (emphasizing that words arguably categorized as true threats must be considered in context to determine if the speech rises to this level of threatening). In 1969, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Watts v. United States* ultimately determined that defendant Robert Watts's statement to kill the President if forced to take part in the war effort was not a true threat because it was conditional and in the context of a larger political debate. *Id.* at 707; see Jennifer Elrod, *Expressive Activity, True Threats, and the First Amendment*, 36 CONN. L. REV. 541, 543 (2004) (examining the gray area that exists when threats are made outside of a neutral setting, such as in the context of political debate).

60 Elrod, *supra* note 59, at 577–78; see also Beausoleil, *supra* note 11, at 2121 (illustrating what courts consider when examining threats, which includes context, “reactions of listeners, the nature of the threat, . . . any prior incidents where the speaker had threatened the victim, and any potential reasons for the recipient of the threat to believe that the speaker had violent propensities”).

73a

Most courts apply an objective standard when they look at the context and content of the speech to determine if a reasonable person would perceive the speech as a true threat.⁶⁰

**APPENDIX I
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY
PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

1. **U.S. Constitution Amendment I:** Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.
2. **U.S. Constitution Amendment XIV:** All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.
3. **18 U.S. Code § 2265** - Full faith and credit given to protection orders.
(b)Protection Order, - A protection order issued by a State, tribal, or territorial court is consistent with this subsection if -
 - (1) Such court has jurisdiction over the parties and matter under the law of such State, Indian tribe, or territory; and

(2) Reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard is given to the person against whom the order is sought sufficient to protect that person's right to due process. In the case of ex parte orders, notice and opportunity to be heard must be provided within the time required by State, tribal, or territorial law, and in any event within a reasonable time after the order is issued, sufficient to protect the respondent's due process rights.

(c) Cross or Counter Petition.—A protection order issued by a State, tribal, or territorial court against one who has petitioned, filed a complaint, or otherwise filed a written pleading for protection against abuse by a spouse or intimate partner is not entitled to full faith and credit if—

(1) No cross or counter petition, complaint, or other written pleading was filed seeking such a protection order; or

(2) A cross or counter petition has been filed and the court did not make specific findings that each party was entitled to such an order.

4. **28 U.S. Code § 1332** - Diversity of citizenship; amount in controversy; costs

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or

value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between—

(1) citizens of different States;

5. **U.S. Constitution, ARTICLE III, Section 2:** The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;.....~~between citizens of different states;~~.....

6. **H.R.7178 - CHIPS for America Act 116th Congress (2019-2020):** This bill establishes investments and incentives to support U.S. semiconductor manufacturing, *research and development*, and supply chain security.

7. **Rule 10. Considerations Governing Review on Writ of Certiorari:**

(a) a United States court of appeals has entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another United States court of appeals on the same important matter; has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power;

(c) a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court,...

8. **28 U.S. Code § 1257 - State courts; certiorari** (a)Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of any State is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States.

9. **Rule 1003. Admissibility of Duplicates** (from

https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rule_1003)

When the only concern is with getting the words or other contents before the court with accuracy and precision, then a counterpart serves equally as well as the original, if the counterpart is the product of a method which insures accuracy and genuineness. By definition in Rule 1001(4), *supra*, a "duplicate" possesses this character.

Therefore, if no genuine issue exists as to authenticity and no other reason exists for

requiring the original, a duplicate is admissible under the rule. This position finds support in the decisions, *Myrick v. United States*, 332 F.2d 279 (5th Cir. 1964), no error in admitting photostatic copies of checks instead of original microfilm in absence of suggestion to trial judge that photostats were incorrect; *Johns v. United States*, 323 F.2d 421 (5th Cir. 1963), not error to admit concededly accurate tape recording made from original wire recording; *Sauget v. Johnston*, 315 F.2d 816 (9th Cir. 1963), not error to admit copy of agreement when opponent had original and did not on appeal claim any discrepancy. Other reasons for requiring the original may be present when only a part of the original is reproduced and the remainder is needed for cross-examination or may disclose matters qualifying the part offered or otherwise useful to the opposing party. *United States v. Alexander*, 326 F.2d 736 (4th Cir. 1964). And see *Toho Bussan Kaisha, Ltd. v. American President Lines, Ltd.*, 265 F.2d 418, 76 A.L.R.2d 1344 (2d Cir. 1959).

APPENDIX JLetter to Microsoft

Dear Microsoft/Satya (Nadella)/John (Shewchuk),

You were like our guests when you came to Portland, OR and organized openhack back in Dec 2018. Your employee failed to carry out professional duties and did not intentionally sent the scientific challenges to the openhack even after she verbally committed that she will send. This is breach of verbal contract and she has broken that law. I was enthusiastic about collaborating on creating auto place and route of chip layout & layout design rule checker using the artificial intelligence techniques I learned at your openhack. Since I was not expert at the time in artificial intelligence/computer vision that is where the collaboration from your employee, Christy Haerim Won, was needed and would have gone a very long way professionally. I was directly working on Intel's in-house Electronic Design Automation tools for physical design so was at the heart of the innovation to push state of art forward. We lost that opportunity to create that intellectual property.

I genuinely wanted to relocate to Seattle and work for you as you hired many of my friends/colleagues from Intel but sadly the events in this case coerced & forced me to think otherwise. Being responsible citizen of this country someone has to raise voice against the practices that drive country's semiconductor technology down to foreign competitors. You should ask your ex-Intel employees to use Intel's technology to fabricate the chips they will design instead of going to TSMC. It is not too

late to make that decision. Create business even if you have hired the talent from competitive business. Save some tax payers' money instead of government keeping afloat semiconductor technology of our country with Chips for America Act.

I have failed to understand why we sing about woman empowerment, collaboration & diversity inclusion when your employee and the court has looked down upon my contact with her as if I am making undue advances towards her. Your employee was checking me out during openhack. Your employee and her friend (your former employee) were stalking on me over twitter & linkedin and writing coercive cryptic messages. My wife & daughter are not empowered.

You may be concluding that I am mixing family life with professional life. When big tech CEOs vision is to include life into work and vice-versa and more than half of my day's time & life's time is devoted at work to earn for my family, then why I should not mix family with professional life? Why you should not be responsible for creating hostile living environment for me & my family when your employee targeted values sacred to me, given the fact I was only trying to have amicable situation and getting best out of intellectual values? It is problem with your employee that she thinks I am making advances onto her. These thoughts of her in and of itself are coercive & defamatory for me.

You should have contacted me to understand what happened when your employee first informed you.

81a

This is negligence on your part being professional. You had an opportunity to contact me when I returned the certificate back to you on Aug 27th, 2019 but you did not. That is also negligence on your part.

Since this case has stretched so far with the Washington courts favoring you and your employee I did not get any justice and hence through this letter, I am virtually returning the badges that you gave me as a participant and also virtually returning the certificate back to you which I earned from your Los Angeles openhack (very nice & humble coach from LA openhack). Your employee did not give me closure from all the abusive malicious harassment she carried out on me targeting my family, leaving me & my family to not only digest your employee's inflicted trauma but also the negative stance by court which arose due to her outright perjury & unethical behavior.

Sincerely,

Mandeep Singh

Letter To Singh's daughter from Singh

My Dear Love NS,

Your dad was involved in situation where he wanted to earn good for you through intellectual values he inculcated from great institutions. Sadly, it was looked down by some people as if I am making some

82a

sort of negative advances onto them. In return they abused me and targeted you and our relation including my relation with your mommy. I tried to put myself in their shoes, tried to forget the abuse but all I conclude is that they should not have used bad words on you, your mommy & our relation. The only thing that kept me alive was you and your mom. I attempted to explain it to these people but in vain.

The court kept you & your mommy outside the court room when these people felt they are hurt but the court ignored the bad hurting words these people inflicted on you, your mommy & our relation at the first place. They have not apologized for the bad words they said to you even after explaining to them. Your dad did not perpetuate fraud upon court. The Washington state courts are not following the rules and not applying the law and are not intentionally establishing facts. They favor people from their own state & Microsoft. Your dad will try all he can under the law to get justice.

With Infinite Love,

Mandeep Singh

Letter to The Honorable Justices by Singh's Wife

Dear The Honorable Justices,

My name is Navdeep and I'm Mandeep's wife. There is a saying that words are louder than actions. This exactly happened in our case. Ms. Won's words had left us in shock and misery. Our family has been affected because of false allegations and Judges' wrong decisions. It's been three years that we have been pushed in to a dark tunnels where there is no light on other side. Our night and days turns in to dark due to misleading information by Ms. Won.

Laws are made to protect the families or individuals rights. We have been suffering from last three year due to wrong allegations by Ms. Won and Judges wrong decisions has taken my opportunity of getting education, my daughter's education and leaving us in financially broken and dark future.

Moreover, our daughter was one year old and she turned four now. My husband has lost all the years to spend time with her due to depression. Our lives have turned in to graveyard.

Mandeep has been jobless from past two and half year due to depression. I have been the only one working to keep our house running. We have lost our dream home and have been in accidents twice. It was miracle we are alive today. Second accident, Mandeep was alone and had terrible accident and our car got totaled. We are very thankful to that miracle that saved his life. After all the loss we suffered yet we are the one being punished with

wrong allegations. Mandeep name putting in criminal records has shocked us. It's taking his opportunity to excel anywhere for a job. Who would give a job to person who's name is affiliated in criminal records when it's not even true 1% . I am failing to understand how all the things Ms. Won has done to us being ignored?

Mandeep and I have been married for past eight years now. We always discuss all the problems if there was any. Mandeep has been our main pillar of the house not only for us but for his brother and people whom he supports in education. He has been always there whether he gets opportunity to help financially or to provide his skills to others. Mandeep always have dreams to bring change in society for better manner. In fact always believe in moving forward with positivity.

Similarly, he was trying to move further with positivity which named as harassment by Ms. Won. As Ms. Won put allegation that my husband is after her. I just wanted bring to the court attention that if someone is going to be after a woman that person won't ever let their wife know their intentions. Mandeep has always discussed with me regarding his problems. I was in India for a month when Ms. Won used abusive language. Mandeep in fact called me to come back home as soon as possible.

I also remember when Mandeep came home after his open hack meeting (his first meeting with Ms Won) he mentioned to me about Ms. Won that she has

...skills that he has been looking to work on the project.

Mandy has been always opportunist. He only saw opportunity and skills which he wanted to acquire not only with his will but Ms. Won also showed interest. Ms. Won using wrong words towards my husband and about our marriage and our child let us in shock. It was just as someone has spit on us and walked away. It hurts when a person using filthy language you consider as a friend. When Mandeep tried to find out in a calm manner what went wrong with Ms. Won each sentence of her started with "F" word. Ms. Won abusive language left him in shock. Mandeep had discussed his project ideas with her. Perhaps that was the reason that she turned back and went so against him.

After her threatening words to Mandeep, "*I will show you hell*" put him in a shock that what is she going to do with us? He was so much confused as Mandeep was in process changing his job, was thinking to work at Microsoft. He doesn't wanted to move there in bitter feeling thinking they may cross path again there in the company which make him feel uncomfortable.

I would request you to please go through the sequence of events which would help to make better decisions for our family. Please also review why Ms. Won would call on the day before trial if she thinks that Mandeep is after her. Please review what was Mandeep motive behind this when his wife Navdeep knows everything.

Ignoring Mandeep's facts like nothing happened by judges is putting many lives in misery. It's cutting my wings to grow my career and my daughter and many more family members as Mandeep has been our pillar to motivate us towards education, opportunities and positivity.

We want Ms. Won to live happy and grow in her career as long as her happiness is not in someone's misery.

Lastly, we want to grow and make better society. Our intentions are never to hurt anyone. I would request as a wife, mother and a good citizen to remove all the wrong allegations from my husband. Removing wrong allegations will not only give many lives to give reason to live in this society but also prevent people use abusive language against each other for no reason.

Respectfully,

Navdeep Kaur

APPENDIX K

"....blessed with beautiful daughter (15 months old at the time) who I'll be showing this world to, as you are daughter to your parents...I will not contact you for days or weeks or months ...I am writing an article (semiconductor technology) that clubs together my work experience and what I learned at (your) openhack (hackathon)..." - Singh to Won on Jan 20th, 2019 in email. Pre-COVID era.

In a threatening & coercive environment for Singh created by Won, this plea of Singh to Won was never as if Singh is making undue advances towards Won or harassing Won. Given the fact Singh already apologized Dec 20th, 2018 to Won on any misunderstanding on respectable & professional sequence of events from Dec 11th, 2018 till Dec 19th, 2018. Specifically, when Singh was trying to get the best out of intellectual values where with those intellectual values he can not only empower his daughter and wife but also Won along with reasonable & enthusiastic attempt to improving semiconductor technology (*Chips for America Act 2019*) at Intel Corp through artificial intelligence – where Won is experienced in artificial intelligence from Microsoft Corp & Singh was experienced in semiconductor technology from Intel Corp. Amendment XIV - Liberty of Singh to improve (t)his world through collaboration & humble means to create intellectual property.